

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The rejections presented in the Office Action dated May 22, 2006 (hereinafter Office Action) have been considered. Claims 1-46 remain pending in the application.

Reconsideration of the pending claims and allowance of the application in view of the present response is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 10-19 and 22-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,640,097 to *Corrigan et al.* (hereinafter "*Corrigan*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,728,215 to *Alperovich et al.* (hereinafter "*Alperovich*").

Three criteria must be met to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference, or combination of references, must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP § 2142. Applicants respectfully disagree with the rejection because the prior art fails to disclose all the claim limitations, there would be no motivation to combine or modify the references as proposed by the Examiner, and any such combination or modification would not successfully achieve the invention recited in the claims.

Independent claims 1, 22, 24, 35, 45, and 46, as amended, include in some form a limitation directed to the ability of the Web Services endpoint to advertise its services. Neither *Corrigan* nor *Alperovich* teach least this limitation which is now included in all the independent claims. The *prima facie* case of obviousness fails because references do not meet the third criterion discussed above. In view of the failure of the references to teach or suggest all the claim limitations, the teachings of *Corrigan* and *Alperovich* would provide insufficient guidance for one of ordinary skill in the art having these references before him/her to successfully make the combination or modification suggested by the Office Action.

Claim 10 is directed to the interface for advertising push services. Claim 10 has been amended to harmonize the language of claim 10 with claim 1, as amended. Regarding

the rejection of claim 10, the Office Action states at col. 5, lines 20-25 that *Corrigan* teaches a registry to advertise its push service. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The analysis presented in the Office Action is in error because the Web Services endpoint advertisement feature is not taught or suggested at the indicated section or elsewhere. Col. 5 lines 21-30 of *Corrigan* states that the node allows service providers to create online descriptions of available services including tariffs and subscription fees. *Corrigan* teaches that the service providers, not the access node, can create these online descriptions. *Corrigan* is silent regarding the ability of the Web Services gateway to advertise the push services of the Web Services gateway.

Dependent claims 2-4, 6-7, 10-19, 23, 25-34, and 36-44, which are dependent from independent claims 1, 22, 24, or 35 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of *Corrigan* and *Alperovich*. While Applicants do not acquiesce with any particular rejections to these dependent claims, it is believed that these rejections are now moot in view of the remarks made in connection with the independent claims. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited references. "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. §103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." M.P.E.P. §2143.03; citing *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, dependent Claims 2-4, 6-7, 10-19, 23, 25-34, and 36-44 are also allowable over the combination of *Corrigan* and *Alperovich*.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corrigan* and *Alperovich* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0019951 to Haumount (hereinafter "*Haumount*"). Claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corrigan* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0156831 by *Suorsa et al.* (hereinafter "*Suorsa*"). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corrigan* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0190887 by *Hook et al.* (hereinafter "*Hook*"). Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being

unpatentable over *Corrigan* and *Alperovich* in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/005/0051 by *Vilander* (hereinafter "*Vilander*").

Each of the above-listed obviousness rejections depends on *Corrigan* as the primary reference. Applicants reassert the arguments made above regarding *Corrigan*'s failure to teach or suggest all of the claims limitations of the independent claims as required by the third criterion for *prima facie* obviousness. *Haumount*, *Suorsa*, *Hook*, and *Vilander* also fail to teach or suggest at least the limitation related to advertisement of services of the Web Services end point. While Applicants do not acquiesce with any particular rejections to these dependent claims, it is believed that these rejections are now moot in view of the remarks made in connection with the independent claims. For at least these reasons, dependent claims 5, 8-9, 20, and 21 are not obvious in view of the asserted combinations.

It is to be understood that Applicants do not acquiesce to Examiner's characterization of the asserted art or Applicants' claimed subject matter, nor of the Examiner's application of the asserted art or combinations thereof to Applicants' claimed subject matter. Moreover, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner's statements or conclusions concerning what would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, obvious design choices, common knowledge at the time of Applicants' invention, officially noticed facts, and the like. Applicants reserve the right to address in detail the Examiner's characterizations, conclusions, and rejections in future prosecution.

Authorization is given to charge Deposit Account No. 50-3581 (NOKM.015PA) any necessary fees for this filing. If the Examiner believes it necessary or helpful, the undersigned attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her to discuss any issues related to this case.

Respectfully submitted,

HOLLINGSWORTH & FUNK, LLC  
8009 34<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, Suite 125  
Minneapolis, MN 55425  
952.854.2700

Date: August 22, 2006

By: 

Clara Davis  
Reg. No. 50,495